On Quantum Tensor Product Codes

Jihao Fan,[1,*] Yonghui Li,[2,†] Min-Hsiu Hsieh,[3,‡] and Hanwu Chen[1,4,§]

[1] *School of Computer Science and Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing, Jiangsu 211189, China*
[2] *School of Electrical and Information Engineering, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*
[3] *Centre for Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia*
[4] *Key Laboratory of Computer Network and Information Integration (Southeast University), Ministry of Education, Nanjing, Jiangsu 211189, China*

(Dated: October 4, 2016)

In this paper, we present a general framework for the construction of quantum tensor product codes (QTPC). In a classical tensor product code (TPC), its parity check matrix is constructed via the tensor product of parity check matrices of the two component codes. We show that by adding some constraints on the component codes, we can get several classes of dual-containing TPCs. By selecting different component codes, the proposed method enables the construction of a large family of QTPCs and they can provide the similar quantum error control abilities as the corresponding classical TPCs. In particular, if one of the component codes is selected as a burst error-correction code, then QTPCs have multiple quantum burst error-correction abilities, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks. Compared with concatenated quantum codes (CQC), the component code selections of QTPCs are much more flexible than those of CQCs since only one of the component codes of QTPCs needs to satisfy the dual-containing restriction. Furthermore, we show that it is possible to construct QTPCs with parameters better than other classes of quantum error-correction codes (QECC), e.g., CQCs and quantum BCH codes. It is known that classical TPCs cannot have parameters better than classical BCH codes. However, we show that QTPCs can have better parameters than quantum BCH codes. Many QTPCs are obtained with parameters better than previously known QECCs available in the literature.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Pp, 03.67.Hk

arXiv:1605.09598v3 [quant-ph] 7 Jun 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum information is sensitive and vulnerable to quantum noise during the process of quantum computations and quantum communications. By employing redundancy, quantum error-correction codes (QECC) can provide the effective protection of quantum information against errors caused by decoherence and other quantum noise. As shown in the pioneering work in [1, 2], it is possible to construct QECCs from classical error-correction codes (ECC) that subject to certain constraints. Furthermore, stabilizer codes [3–5] provide a more general framework to construct QECCs analogous to classical additive codes.

Classical tensor product codes (TPC) were first proposed by Wolf in the 1960's [6, 7] and were later generalized in [8]. The parity check matrix of a TPC is obtained by taking the tensor product of parity check matrices of the two component codes. Based on the choice of the component codes, TPCs can be designed to provide error-correction, error-detection or error-location properties. Recently, several classes of TPCs have been considered to be used in data storage systems, e.g., in magnetic recording [9–11], in Flash memory [12, 13] and in the construction of locally repairable codes (LRC) which are applied in distributed storage systems [14, 15]. In [9], an iteratively decodable TPC by concatenating an error-pattern correction code (EPCC) with a q-ary LDPC code was proposed. The tensor product concatenating scheme could significantly improve the efficiency of the inner parity code while retaining a similar performance.

In [16], quantum block and convolutional codes based on self-orthogonal tensor product codes with component codes over the same field were constructed. Then in [17], asymmetric quantum product codes were constructed from the tensor product of two Reed-Solomon (RS) codes. We should emphasize that although quantum tensor product codes (QTPC) were first proposed by Grassl and Rötteler in [16], they had only considered the construction of QTPCs from classical TPCs with component codes over the same field. The design of QTPCs from TPCs with one of the component codes over the extension field has not been considered. However, TPCs with one of the component codes over the extension field are more important and have more practical applications, see [6, 7, 9–15].

In this paper, we propose a generalized construction of a series of QTPCs based on classical TPCs with one of the component codes over the extension field. The proposed QTPCs will exhibit quantum error-correction, quantum

* fanjh12@seu.edu.cn
† yonghui.li@sydney.edu.au
‡ min-hsiu.hsieh@uts.edu.au
§ hw_chen@seu.edu.cn

error-detection or quantum error-location properties as their classical counterparts. We show that as long as one of the component codes of classical TPCs satisfies certain dual-containing condition, the resultant TPC will satisfy the dual-containing condition for constructing QECCs. As a result, the choice of the other component code can be selected without the dual-containing restriction. Several classes of QTPCs with different error control abilities are obtained. Compared with other quantum concatenation schemes, such as concatenated quantum codes (CQC) [18, 19], the component code selections of QTPCs are more flexible than those of CQCs. As we know, CQCs cannot be constructed from classical concatenated codes directly. A CQC is usually constructed from two component QECCs: an outer QECC and an inner QECC [18, 19], e.g., a quantum RS code as the outer code and a binary QECC as the inner code. Therefore, both the outer and inner component codes need to be QECCs. By contrast, only one of the component codes of QTPCs needs to satisfy the dual-containing restriction. Furthermore, if letting the minimum distance be a comparable length, QTPCs can have dimension much larger than the dimension of CQCs with the same length and minimum distance. Two families of QTPCs with better parameters than CQCs are constructed. Moreover, several families of QTPCs are obtained with parameters better than quantum BCH codes in [20, 21] or QECCs with minimum distance five and six in [22]. It is known that classical TPCs cannot have parameters better than classical BCH codes in classical coding theory. However, QTPCs can have parameters better than quantum BCH codes in the quantum case.

More recently, a comprehensive survey in [23] discussed the memory effects in quantum channels and it was shown that these effects can be accurately described by correlated error models, for which quantum burst error-correction codes (QBECC) (see [24, 25]) should be designed to cope with these correlated errors. However, the construction of QBECCs with single or multiple burst error-correction abilities has received less attention. We show that QTPCs have multiple quantum burst error-correction abilities as their classical counterparts if one of the component codes is chosen as a burst error-correction code, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II gives a brief review of QECCs and classical TPCs. Section III proposes a general framework for the construction of QTPCs by investigating the dual-containing properties of classical TPCs. Then in Section IV, several families of QTPCs are constructed and are compared with other classes of QECCs. Section V gives a special class of QTPCs with multiple burst error-correction abilities. The decoding of QTPCs is given in Section VI. Conclusions and discussions are shown in Section VII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we first review some basic definitions and facts of QECCs, followed by the introduction of classical TPCs. We only consider the binary QECCs, i.e., the qubit systems.

Let $q = 2$ or $q = 4$. Let $GF(q)$ denote the finite field with q elements. The trace mapping $\mathrm{Tr} : GF(4) \to GF(2)$ is given by $\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha) = \alpha + \alpha^2$. Denote by $GF(q^m)$ a field extension of degree m of the field $GF(q)$. Let C be a linear code over $GF(q)$, the dual code of C is denoted by

$$C^{\perp} = \{c \in GF(q)^n | x \cdot c = 0,\ \forall x \in C\}. \tag{1}$$

For two vectors $u = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)$, $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n) \in GF(4)^n$, the Hermitian inner product of vectors u and v is denoted by

$$(u, v)_h = u \cdot \overline{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i v_i^2, \tag{2}$$

and the trace-Hermitian inner product of u and v is denoted by

$$(u, v)_{th} = \mathrm{Tr}(u \cdot \overline{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (u_i v_i^2 + u_i^2 v_i), \tag{3}$$

where $\overline{v} = (v_1^2, v_2^2, \ldots, v_n^2)$ denotes the conjugate of vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$. Let D be a classical additive code over $GF(4)$, the Hermitian dual code of D is denoted by

$$D^{\perp_h} = \{v \in GF(4)^n | (u, v)_h = 0, \forall u \in D\}, \tag{4}$$

and the trace-Hermitian dual code of D is denoted by

$$D^{\perp_{th}} = \{y \in GF(4)^n | (x, y)_{th} = 0, \forall x \in D\}. \tag{5}$$

A. Quantum error-correction Codes

Let $\mathbb{C}$ denote the complex number field. For a positive integer n, let $V_n = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n} = \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$ be the nth tensor product of $\mathbb{C}^2$ representing the quantum Hilbert space over n qubits. We denote by $\{|x\rangle | x \in GF(2)\}$ the vectors of an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Let $a, b \in GF(2)$. The unitary operator $X(a)$ and $Z(b)$ are defined by $X(a)|x\rangle = |x + a\rangle$ and $Z(b)|x\rangle = (-1)^{b \cdot x}|x\rangle$, respectively. Let $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ be two vectors over $GF(2)$. Denote by $X(\mathbf{a}) = X(a_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes X(a_n)$ and $Z(\mathbf{b}) = Z(b_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes Z(b_n)$ the tensor products of n error operators. Then the set $E_n = \{X(\mathbf{a})Z(\mathbf{b}) | \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in GF(2)^n\}$ is an error basis on the quantum Hilbert space V_n. The finite group $G_n = \{\pm X(\mathbf{a})Z(\mathbf{b}) | \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in GF(2)^n\}$ is the error group associated with the error basis E_n.

Definition 1. *A stabilizer code $Q = ((n, 2^k))$ is a 2^k-dimensional subspace of $V_n = \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$ that satisfies $Q = \bigcap_{e \in S} \{v \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n} | ev = v\}$, for some commutative subgroup S of G_n. If Q has minimum distance d, then it is denoted by $Q = ((n, 2^k, d))$ or $Q = [[n, k, d]]$.*

According to [5, 26], each binary stabilizer code Q (also called additive quantum code) corresponds to a classical additive code D that is self-orthogonal with respect to the trace-Hermitian inner product over $GF(4)$.

Theorem 1 ([5, 26]). *An $((n, K, d))$ additive quantum code exists if and only if there exists an additive code D over $GF(4)$ of cardinality $|D| = 2^n/K$ such that $D \subseteq D^{\perp_{th}}$, and $d = wt(D^{\perp_{th}} \backslash D)$ if $K > 1$ (and $d = wt(D^{\perp_{th}})$ if $K = 1$), where $wt(A) = \min\{wt(a)|a \in A\}$, $\forall A \subseteq GF(4)^n$.*

If the additive code D in Theorem 1 happens to be linear over $GF(4)$, then the trace-Hermitian dual code of D is equal to the Hermitian dual code of D, i.e., $D^{\perp_{th}} = D^{\perp_h}$. Thus, quantum codes can be constructed from classical linear codes.

Lemma 1 ([5, 27]).

1). (CSS Construction): *Let C_1 and C_2 be two binary linear codes with parameters $[n, k_1, d_1]$ and $[n, k_2, d_2]$ such that $C_2^\perp \subseteq C_1$. Then there exists an $[[n, k_1 + k_2 - n, d]]$ QECC with minimum distance $d = \min\{wt(c)|c \in (C_1 \backslash C_2^\perp) \cup (C_2 \backslash C_1^\perp)\}$ which is pure to $\min\{d_1, d_2\}$. If d_1 and d_2 are less than the minimum distances of $C_2^\perp$ and $C_1^\perp$, respectively, then the QECC is pure and has minimum distance $\min\{d_1, d_2\}$.*

2). (Hermitian Construction): *If there exists a quaternary $[n, k, d]$ linear code D such that $D^{\perp_h} \subseteq D$, then there exists an $[[n, 2k-n, d]]$ QECC with minimum distance $d = \min\{wt(c)|c \in D \backslash D^{\perp_h}\}$ which is pure to d. If d is less than the minimum distance of $D^{\perp_h}$, then the QECC is pure and has minimum distance d.*

Let E be a set of possible quantum errors that belong to G_n. Let $\mathbf{e} = \{(\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{b})|X(\mathbf{a})Z(\mathbf{b}) \in E \text{ or } -X(\mathbf{a})Z(\mathbf{b}) \in E\}$ be the corresponding set of classical errors. Denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_X &= \{\mathbf{a} \in GF(2)^n | \exists \mathbf{b} \in GF(2)^n, (\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{b}) \in \mathbf{e}\}, \\ \mathbf{e}_Z &= \{\mathbf{b} \in GF(2)^n | \exists \mathbf{a} \in GF(2)^n, (\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{b}) \in \mathbf{e}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_X$ and $\mathbf{e}_Z$ are called bit error class and phase error class, respectively. Then, the CSS construction is generalized to correct any quantum errors of set E in [24].

Lemma 2 ([24, Theorem 2]). *Let E be a set of possible quantum errors. If there are $[n, k]$ classical codes $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ such that $\mathcal{C}_2^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ has $\mathbf{e}_X$-correction ability, $\mathcal{C}_2$ has $\mathbf{e}_Z$-correction ability, then there exists an $[[n, 2^{2k-n}]]$ QECC that has E-correction ability.*

Let C_1 and C_2 be two linear codes over $GF(q)$ with parity check matrices H_1 and H_2, respectively. It is easy to see that $C_2^\perp \subseteq C_1$ is equivalent to $H_1 H_2^T = 0$. Let D be a quaternary linear code with the parity check matrix H, then $D^{\perp_h} \subseteq D$ is equivalent to $HH^\dagger = 0$, where the dagger ($\dagger$) denotes the conjugate transpose operation over matrices in $GF(4)$.

B. Classical Tensor Product Codes

Let $C = [n, k, d]_q$ be a classical linear code over $GF(q)$, where n is the code length, k is the dimension, d is the minimum distance, and let $\rho = n - k$ be the number of check symbols. Define the random error-pattern class ξ_1 as the class of error-patterns of weight less than or equal to r. Define the burst error-pattern class ξ_2 as the class of error-patterns in which the errors span no more than b symbols. Let H_{c_1} be the parity check matrix of a linear code $C_1 = [n_1, k_1, d_1]_q$, and the number of check symbols is $\rho_1 = n_1 - k_1$. We assume C_1 corrects any error-pattern that belongs to class $\xi_i (i = 1 \text{ or } 2)$. Let $C_2 = [n_2, k_2, d_2]_{q^{\rho_1}}$ be a linear code over the extension field $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, and the number of check symbols is $\rho_2 = n_2 - k_2$. Let H_{c_2} be the parity check matrix of C_2, and assume C_2 corrects any error-pattern belongs to class $\zeta_i (i = 1 \text{ or } 2)$, where ζ_1 denotes a random error-pattern class and ζ_2 denotes a burst error-pattern class. We denote by

$$\mathcal{C} \equiv C_2 \otimes_H C_1 \quad (7)$$

the tensor product code[1] of C_1 and C_2. If we consider H_{c_1} as a $1 \times n_1$ matrix with elements from $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, then the parity check matrix $H_{\mathcal{C}}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ is the tensor product of H_{c_1} and H_{c_2}

$$H_{\mathcal{C}} = H_{c_2} \otimes H_{c_1}. \quad (8)$$

Convert the elements of $H_{\mathcal{C}}$ into q-ary columns with $GF(q)$ elements, then we can obtain the parity check matrix of $\mathcal{C}$ with $GF(q)$ elements.

Lemma 3 ([6, Theorem 1]). *If the codewords of $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes_H C_1$ consist of n_2 subblocks, each subblock containing n_1 codewords, then the code $\mathcal{C}$ can correct all error-patterns where the subblocks containing errors form a pattern belonging to class $\xi_i (i = 1 \text{ or } 2)$ and the errors within each erroneous subblock fall within the class $\zeta_i (i = 1 \text{ or } 2)$.*

The elements of the parity check matrix H_{c_2} can also be represented by the companion matrices (see [8, 29]). Let $f(x) = f_0 + f_1 x + \cdots + f_{\rho_1 - 1} x^{\rho_1 - 1} + x^{\rho_1}$ be a primitive polynomial of degree ρ_1 over $GF(2^{\rho_1})$ and let α be a primitive element of $GF(2^{\rho_1})$. The companion matrix M of $f(x)$ is defined to be the $\rho_1 \times \rho_1$ matrix, see Ref. [28, Ch.4],

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ f_0 & f_1 & f_2 & \cdots & f_{\rho_1 - 1} \end{bmatrix}_{\rho_1 \times \rho_1} \quad (9)$$

[1] The direct product code defined by the direct product of the generator matrices of C_1 and C_2 is usually denoted by $C_1 \otimes C_2$ (see [28]). In order to distinguish from it, we add a subscript 'H' under the tensor product.

Then for any element $a = \alpha^i$ of $GF(2^{\rho_1})$, the companion matrix of a is denoted by $[a] = M^i$, a $\rho_1 \times \rho_1$ matrix with $GF(2)$ elements. Denote the parity check matrix of the component code C_2 by $H_{c_2} = (b_{ij})_{\rho_2 \times n_2}$ with $GF(2^{\rho_1})$ elements, i.e., $b_{ij} \in GF(2^{\rho_1})$ for $1 \le i \le \rho_2$ and $1 \le j \le n_2$. We use the notation in [29] and denote by $[H_{c_2}] = ([b_{ij}])_{\rho_1\rho_2 \times \rho_1 n_2}$ the companion matrix representation of H_{c_2}. Then the parity check matrix $H_{\mathcal{C}}$ of a binary TPC can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{[\mathcal{C}]} &= [H_{c_2}] \otimes H_{c_1} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} [b_{11}]H_{c_1} & [b_{12}]H_{c_1} & \cdots & [b_{1n_2}]H_{c_1} \\ [b_{21}]H_{c_1} & [b_{22}]H_{c_1} & \cdots & [b_{2n_2}]H_{c_1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ [b_{\rho_2 1}]H_{c_1} & [b_{\rho_2 2}]H_{c_1} & \cdots & [b_{\rho_2 n_2}]H_{c_1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Typically, the minimum distance of the resultant TPCs is bounded by the minimum distance of the component codes, and the code length and the number of check symbols get multiplied.

Lemma 4 ([6, 8]). *Let $C_1 = [n_1, k_1, d_1]_q$ and $C_2 = [n_2, k_2, d_2]_{q^{\rho_1}}$ be two linear codes, and the numbers of check symbols are $\rho_1 = n_1 - k_1$ and $\rho_2 = n_2 - k_2$, respectively. Then the tensor product code $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes_H C_1$ has parameters $[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - \rho_1\rho_2, \min\{d_1, d_2\}]_q$.*

III. QUANTUM TENSOR PRODUCT CODES

In general, a classical TPC can be constructed from arbitrary two shorter codes over the same field or with one of the component codes over the extension field. In [16], QTPCs based on self-orthogonal tensor product codes with component codes over the same field were constructed.

Lemma 5 ([16]). *Let H_{c_1} and H_{c_2} be the parity check matrices of two classical linear codes C_1 and C_2 over $GF(q)(q = 2 \text{ or } 4)$, respectively. Denote by $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the tensor product code of C_1 and C_2 whose parity check matrix is given by H, then $\mathcal{C}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ if and only if $C_1^\perp \subseteq C_1$ or $C_2^\perp \subseteq C_2$, $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_h} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ if and only if $C_1^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_1$ or $C_2^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_2$.*

From Lemma 5, it is easy to see that if there is a linear code satisfying $C_1^\perp \subseteq C_1$ (or $C_1^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_1$), we can concatenate it with an arbitrary linear code C_2 over the same field to get a dual-containing TPC. As a special case, if we use self-dual codes to construct TPCs, the following QTPCs can be constructed.

Corollary 1. *Let C be an arbitrary self-dual code over $GF(q)(q = 2 \text{ or } 4)$ with parameters $[n, n/2, d]$. Then there exists a binary QTPC with parameters $[[n^2, n^2/2, d]]$, and $d \ge H_q^{-1}(1/2)n$ when $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. From Lemma 5 and Ref. [16], we know that there exists a binary QTPC with parameters $[[n^2, n^2/2, d]]$. According to Ref. [28, Ch. 19], there exist long q-ary self-dual codes which achieve the Gilbert-Varshamov bound, i.e., $d \ge H_q^{-1}(1/2)n$ when $n \to \infty$, where $H_q^{-1}(x)$ is the inverse of the entropy function. □

While considering TPCs with one of the component codes over the extension field, we show that if one of the component codes satisfies certain dual-containing conditions, the resultant TPCs can also be dual contained.

Let α be a primitive element of $GF(q^{\rho_1})$ and assume that the basis used for vector representation of elements in $GF(q^{\rho_1})$ is $\{1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \ldots, \alpha^{\rho_1 - 1}\}$. We define the bijective map $\psi : GF(q^{\rho_1}) \mapsto GF(q)^{\rho_1}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\beta) &= \psi(a_0 + a_1\alpha + \cdots + a_{\rho_1 - 1}\alpha^{\rho_1 - 1}) \\ &\equiv (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{\rho_1 - 1})^T, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\beta = a_0 + a_1\alpha + \cdots + a_{\rho_1 - 1}\alpha^{\rho_1 - 1}$ is an element of $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, $a_i \in GF(q)$ for $0 \le i \le \rho_1 - 1$, and T is a a transpose of vector.

For the parity check matrix $H = (\alpha_{ij})_{k \times n}$ of code C over $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, we denote by

$$\psi(H) \equiv \big(\psi(\alpha_{ij})\big)_{k\rho_1 \times n}$$

the matrix with elements converted from H under ψ, and we denote by $\psi(C)$ the corresponding subfield subcode with parity check matrix $\psi(H)$. The inverse map of ψ can be defined as

$$\psi^{-1} : \ GF(q)^{\rho_1} \mapsto GF(q^{\rho_1}) \quad (12)$$

based on the same basis $\{1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \ldots, \alpha^{\rho_1 - 1}\}$. For the matrix $H_{c_1} = (c_{ij})_{\rho_1 \times n}$ with $GF(q)$ elements, we denote by

$$\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}) \equiv \big(\psi^{-1}(col_j)\big)_{1 \times n}$$

the matrix with elements converted from H_{c_1} under ψ^{-1}, where $col_j = (c_{1j}, c_{2j}, \ldots, c_{\rho_1 j})^T$ for $1 \le j \le n$. Then the q-ary $\rho_1 \times n_1$ parity check matrix H_{c_1} of C_1 can be considered as a $1 \times n_1$ matrix $\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1})$ with elements from $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, and $H_{\mathcal{C}} = H_{c_2} \otimes \psi^{-1}(H_{c_1})$ is a $\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2$ matrix with elements from $GF(q^{\rho_1})$. If we replace the elements of $H_{\mathcal{C}}$ by ρ_1-tuples based on the same basis over $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, then we can get a $\rho_1\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2$ matrix $\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}})$ with $GF(q)$ elements. Then the null space of the $\rho_1\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2$ q-ary matrix $\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}})$ corresponds to a q-ary TPC with parameters $\mathcal{C} = [n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - \rho_1\rho_2]_q$.

Lemma 6. *Let $C_1 = [n_1, k_1, d_1]_q$ be a q-ary linear code, and let $C_2 = [n_2, k_2, d_2]_{q^{\rho_1}}$ be a linear code over the extension field $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, and the numbers of check symbols are $\rho_1 = n_1 - k_1$ and $\rho_2 = n_2 - k_2$, respectively. Let $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes_H C_1$ be the tensor product code of C_1 and C_2. If $C_1^\perp \subseteq C_1$ or $\psi(C_2)^\perp \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, then $\mathcal{C}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{C}$; If $C_1^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_1$ or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp_h} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, then $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_h} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Let $H_{c_1} = (a_{ij})_{\rho_1 \times n_1}$ be the parity check matrix of C_1 with $GF(q)$ elements. Then $\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}) = [\alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \ \ldots \ \alpha_{n_1}]$ is a $1 \times n_1$ array over $GF(q^{\rho_1})$. Let $H_{c_2} = (\beta_{ij})_{\rho_2 \times n_2}$ be the parity check matrix of C_2 with

elements from the extension field $GF(q^{\rho_1})$. Then the tensor product of H_{c_2} and $\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathcal{C}} &= H_{c_2} \otimes \psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}) \\ &= \big[\beta_{ij}[\ \alpha_1\ \ \alpha_2\ \ \ldots\ \ \alpha_{n_1}\ ]\big]_{\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and we have

$$\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}}) = \big[\psi\big(\beta_{ij}[\ \alpha_1\ \ \alpha_2\ \ \ldots\ \ \alpha_{n_1}\ ]\big)\big]_{\rho_1\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2}. \tag{14}$$

i) Since H_{c_1} is a parity check matrix of C_1 over $GF(q)$, then $\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1})$ is a parity check matrix over $GF(q^{\rho_1})$. It is easy to see that $\beta_{ij}\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1})$ is also a parity check matrix of C_1 over $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, where $1 \le i \le \rho_2$ and $1 \le j \le n_2$. Therefore, $\psi(\beta_{ij}\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}))$ is also a parity check matrix of C_1 over $GF(q)$. Then we have $\psi(\beta_{ij}\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1})) = A_{ij} \cdot H_{c_1}$, where A_{ij} is an invertible $\rho_1 \times \rho_1$ matrix over $GF(q)$. Therefore, $\psi(\beta_{ij}\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}))\psi(\beta_{st}\psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}))^T = A_{ij}H_{c_1}H_{c_1}^T A_{st}^T = 0$ if and only if $H_{c_1}H_{c_1}^T = 0$ for $1 \le i, s \le \rho_2$ and $1 \le j, t \le n_2$. It follows that $\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}})\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}})^T = 0$.

ii) We rearrange columns of the parity check matrix (13) as follows $H'_{\mathcal{C}} = \big[\alpha_i H_{c_2}\big]_{\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2} = \psi^{-1}(H_{c_1}) \otimes H_{c_2}$. It follows that $\psi(H'_{\mathcal{C}}) = \big[\psi\big(\alpha_i H_{c_2}\big)\big]_{\rho_1\rho_2 \times n_1 n_2}$. Then we have $\psi\big(\alpha_i H_{c_2}\big) = B_i \cdot \psi\big(H_{c_2}\big)$, where B_i is an invertible $\rho_1\rho_2 \times \rho_1\rho_2$ matrix over $GF(q)$. Therefore, $\psi\big(\alpha_i H_{c_2}\big)\psi\big(\alpha_i H_{c_2}\big)^T = B_i \psi\big(H_{c_2}\big)\psi\big(H_{c_2}\big)^T B_i^T = 0$ if and only if $\psi\big(H_{c_2}\big)\psi\big(H_{c_2}\big)^T = 0$. It follows that $\psi(H'_{\mathcal{C}})\psi(H'_{\mathcal{C}})^T = 0$. Since $H'_{\mathcal{C}}$ contains the same columns of $H_{\mathcal{C}}$ with different permutations of columns, we also have $\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}})\psi(H_{\mathcal{C}})^T = 0$.

Therefore, we have $\mathcal{C}^{\perp} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. If $C_1^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_1$ or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp_h} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, then $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_h} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ can be obtained similarly. □

From Lemma 6, we know that if the component code C_1 is dual or Hermitian dual contained, then there are no further restrictions such as the dual-containing restrictions on the component code C_2. Therefore, we can combine an arbitrary linear code over the extension field, such as an MDS code or a q^{ρ_1}-ary LDPC code, with a dual-containing binary or quaternary linear code to construct QTPCs using the CSS construction or Hermitian construction. On the other hand, if the component code C_2 satisfies $\psi(C_2)^{\perp} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$ or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp_h} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, then C_1 can be chosen arbitrarily without the dual-containing restriction.

Theorem 2. *Let $C_1 = [n_1, k_1, d_1]_q$ be a q-ary linear code, and let $C_2 = [n_2, k_2, d_2]_{q^{\rho_1}}$ be a linear code over the extension field $GF(q^{\rho_1})$, and the numbers of check symbols are $\rho_1 = n_1 - k_1$ and $\rho_2 = n_2 - k_2$, respectively. If $C_1^{\perp} \subseteq C_1$ ($C_1^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_1$) or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$ ($\psi(C_2)^{\perp_h} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$), then there exists a pure QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2, \min\{d_1, d_2\}]]$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes_H C_1$ be the tensor product code of C_1 and C_2. If $q = 2$ and if $C_1^{\perp} \subseteq C_1$ or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, then $\mathcal{C}^{\perp} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ by Lemma 6. Combining Lemma 1 and Lemma 4, we know that there exists a QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2, \ge \min\{d_1, d_2\}]]$. Let H_{c_1} and H_{c_2} be the parity check matrices of C_1 and C_2, respectively, then $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ has a generator matrix $[H_{c_2}] \otimes H_{c_1}$, and $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ is a concatenated code with $C_1^{\perp}$ as the inner code and with $C_2^{\perp}$ as the outer code from [29]. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ has minimum distance $d^{\perp} = d_1^{\perp} d_2^{\perp}$, where $d_1^{\perp}$ and $d_2^{\perp}$ are the minimum distances of C_1 and C_2, respectively. Since $C_1^{\perp} \subseteq C_1$ or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, there must be $d^{\perp} > \min\{d_1, d_2\}$, if $d_1^{\perp}, d_2^{\perp} > 1$. Hence $\mathcal{Q}$ is pure and has exact minimum distance equal to $\min\{d_1, d_2\}$.

If $q = 4$ and if $C_1^{\perp_h} \subseteq C_1$ or $\psi(C_2)^{\perp_h} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$, then $\mathcal{C}^{\perp_h} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ by Lemma 6. We can obtain a pure QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2, \min\{d_1, d_2\}]]$ by using the Hermitian construction. □

If we use the companion matrix representation to represent the parity check matrix of a binary TPC, we can get the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let H_{c_1} be the parity check matrix of a binary linear code $C_1 = [n_1, k_1, d_1]$, and let H_{c_2} be the parity check matrix of a linear code $C_2 = [n_2, k_2, d_2]_{2^{\rho_1}}$ over the extension field $GF(2^{\rho_1})$, where $\rho_1 = n_1 - k_1$ is the number of check symbols of C_1. If the component code C_2 satisfies $C_2^{\perp} \subseteq C_2$, and $H_{c_1}H_{c_1}^T$ is of full rank, then there exists a pure QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2, \min\{d_1, d_2\}]]$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes C_1$ be the tensor product code of C_1 and C_2, and let $H_{[\mathcal{C}]}$ in (10) be a parity check matrix of $\mathcal{C}$. Denote the product of H_{c_1} and $H_{c_1}^T$ by $S = H_{c_1}H_{c_1}^T$. We know that there always exist two elementary matrices S_l and S_r such that $S_l S S_r$ is a diagonal matrix as follows $S_l S S_r = I_{\rho_1}$, where I_{ρ_1} is a $\rho_1 \times \rho_1$ identity matrix. It follows that $S_l H_{c_1}(S_r^T H_{c_1})^T = S_l H_{c_1} H_{c_1}^T S_r = S_l S S_r = I_{\rho_1}$. Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ be a TPC which has the same parameters with $\mathcal{C}$ by replacing the component matrix H_{c_1} in $H_{[\mathcal{C}]}$ with $S_l H_{c_1}$, and denote by $H_{[\mathcal{C}_1]}$ the parity check matrix of $\mathcal{C}_1$. Let $\mathcal{C}_2$ be another TPC which also has the same parameters with $\mathcal{C}$ by replacing the component matrix H_{c_1} in $H_{[\mathcal{C}]}$ with $S_r H_{c_1}$, and denote by $H_{[\mathcal{C}_2]}$ the parity check matrix of $\mathcal{C}_2$. Then $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ have the same parameters but have different parity check matrix structures. If $C_2^{\perp} \subseteq C_2$, then $H_{c_2}H_{c_2}^T = 0$. It is obvious that this is equal to $[H_{c_2}][H_{c_2}]^T = 0$. It follows that $\sum_{k=1}^{n_2}[b_{ik}][b_{jk}]^T = 0$ for all $1 \le i, j \le \rho_2$. Then there is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_2}[b_{ik}] S_l H_{c_1} H_{c_1}^T S_r [b_{jk}]^T = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2}[b_{ik}] I_{\rho_1} [b_{jk}]^T = 0 \tag{15}$$

for all $1 \le i, j \le \rho_2$. Therefore, we have $H_{[\mathcal{C}_1]}H_{[\mathcal{C}_2]}^T = 0$ which follows that $\mathcal{C}_2^{\perp} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1$.

By combining Lemma 1 and Lemma 4, we know that there exists a QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 -$

TABLE I. Comparisons between QTPCs and CQCs, where QTPCs are constructed based on dual-containing BCH codes and MDS codes, and CQCs are obtained by Ref. [18, 19].

m	n_1	n_2	δ_1	η_1	η_2	QTPCs $\mathcal{Q}$	CQCs C_Q
5	31	$23 \le n_2 \le 2^{15}+1$	7	2	3	$[[31n_2, 31n_2-180, 7]]$	$[[31n_2, 28n_2-112, 6]]$
5	31	$13 \le n_2 \le 2^{15}+1$	6	2	3	$[[31n_2, 31n_2-150, 6]]$	$[[31n_2, 28n_2-112, 6]]$
5	31	$8 \le n_2 \le 2^{10}+1$	5	2	2	$[[31n_2, 31n_2-80, 5]]$	$[[31n_2, 28n_2-56, 4]]$
5	31	$2 \le n_2 \le 2^{10}+1$	4	2	2	$[[31n_2, 31n_2-60, 4]]$	$[[31n_2, 28n_2-56, 4]]$
6	63	$7 \le n_2 \le 4^{15}+1$	7	2	3	$[[63n_2, 63n_2-180, 7]]$	$[[63n_2, 60n_2-240, 6]]$
6	63	$6 \le n_2 \le 4^{15}+1$	6	2	3	$[[63n_2, 63n_2-150, 6]]$	$[[63n_2, 60n_2-240, 6]]$
6	63	$5 \le n_2 \le 4^{9}+1$	5	2	2	$[[63n_2, 63n_2-72, 5]]$	$[[63n_2, 60n_2-120, 4]]$
6	63	$4 \le n_2 \le 4^{9}+1$	4	2	2	$[[63n_2, 63n_2-54, 4]]$	$[[63n_2, 60n_2-120, 4]]$
7	127	$34 \le n_2 \le 2^{49}+1$	15	3	5	$[[127n_2, 127n_2-1372, 15]]$	$[[127n_2, 113n_2-904, 15]]$
7	127	$14 \le n_2 \le 2^{49}+1$	14	2	7	$[[127n_2, 127n_2-1274, 14]]$	$[[127n_2, 124n_2-1488, 14]]$
7	127	$13 \le n_2 \le 2^{42}+1$	13	2	6	$[[127n_2, 127n_2-1008, 13]]$	$[[127n_2, 124n_2-1240, 12]]$
7	127	$18 \le n_2 \le 2^{42}+1$	12	3	4	$[[127n_2, 127n_2-924, 12]]$	$[[127n_2, 113n_2-678, 12]]$
7	127	$11 \le n_2 \le 2^{35}+1$	11	2	5	$[[127n_2, 127n_2-700, 11]]$	$[[127n_2, 124n_2-992, 10]]$
7	127	$10 \le n_2 \le 2^{35}+1$	10	2	5	$[[127n_2, 127n_2-630, 10]]$	$[[127n_2, 124n_2-992, 10]]$

$2\rho_1\rho_2, \ge \min\{d_1, d_2\}]]$. Notice that $d_{\mathcal{C}_1^\perp} = d_{\mathcal{C}_2^\perp} = d_{\mathcal{C}^\perp} = d_{C_1^\perp} d_{C_2^\perp} > \min\{d_1, d_2\}$, thus $\mathcal{Q}$ is pure and has exact minimum distance $\min\{d_1, d_2\}$. □

The dual-containing restriction on C_2 in Theorem 2 is easy to be verified for RS codes, but for other nonbinary codes it becomes difficult to verify them. In Theorem 3, the restriction on C_2 is much easier to be satisfied than that in Theorem 2, but one condition is that the product matrix $H_{c_1} H_{c_1}^T$ needs to to be a full rank.

IV. CODE CONSTRUCTIONS AND COMPARISONS

In this section we present several constructions of QTPCs based on Theorem 2 and make comparisons between QTPCs and other classes of QECCs. Firstly, we give two explicit examples to illustrate the construction of QTPCs.

Example 1. *Let $C_1 = [5, 3, 3]_4$ be a Hermitian dual-containing code over $GF(4)$ in [5]. Let $C_2 = [n_2, n_2 - 2, 3]_{16}$ be an arbitrary MDS code over $GF(16)$ in [28], where $3 \le n_2 \le 17$. Then the corresponding TPC $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes_H C_1 = [5n_2, 5n_2 - 4, 3]_4$ is a Hermitian dual-containing code over $GF(4)$. Therefore, we can obtain a QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[5n_2, 5n_2 - 8, 3]]$ for $3 \le n_2 \le 17$. If $9 \le n_2 \le 17$, then $\mathcal{Q}$ can attain the upper bound in [30].*

Example 2. *Let $C_1 = [n_1, 1, n_1]$ be a binary repetition code. Let $C_2 = [n_2, n_2 - n_1 + 1, n_1]_{2^{\rho_1}}$ be a narrow-sense RS code over $GF(2^{\rho_1})$, where $n_2 = 2^{\rho_1} - 1$, $\rho_1 = n_1 - 1$. Then the subfield subcode $\psi(C_2)$ of RS code C_2 is a narrow-sense BCH code (see [28]). If $n_1 \le 2^{\lceil \frac{\rho_1}{2} \rceil} - 1$, then $\psi(C_2)$ is dual contained according to [20]. Therefore, there exists a QTPC with parameters $[[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2(n_1 - 1)^2, n_1]]$ by Theorem 2. For example, we let $C_1 = [9, 1, 9]$ and let $C_2 = [255, 247, 9]_{2^8}$ be a narrow-sense RS code over $GF(2^8)$, then there exists a QTPC with parameters $[[2295, 2167, 9]]$. The rate is 0.94. In order to construct a CQC with the same length and minimum distance, we choose a binary QECC with parameters $[[15, 9, 3]]$ from [30] as the inner QECC, and choose a quantum MDS code over $GF(2^9)$ with parameters $[[153, 149, 3]]$ as the outer QECC. Then there exists a CQC with parameters $[[2295, 1341, 9]]$. The rate is 0.58. It is shown that the QTPC has a much higher code rate than the CQC.*

A. QTPCs derived from dual-containing BCH codes

In order to get larger numbers of comparable QTPCs and CQCs, we use BCH codes as one of the component codes to construct QTPCs and use quantum BCH codes as the inner codes to construct CQCs. Here, we only consider the use of primitive, narrow-sense BCH codes and quantum primitive, narrow-sense BCH codes, respectively.

TABLE II. Comparisons between QTPCs and CQCs derived from online code tables in [30].

Component Codes C_1	Inner Quantum Codes Q_1	n_2	QTPCs $\mathcal{Q}$	CQCs C_Q
$[16,9,6]_4$	$[[16,14,2]]$	$8 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{14}+1$	$[[16n_2, 16n_2-70, 6]]$	$[[16n_2, 14n_2-56, 6]]$
$[18,9,8]_4$	$[[18,16,2]]$	$16 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{16}+1$	$[[18n_2, 18n_2-126, 8]]$	$[[18n_2, 16n_2-96, 8]]$
$[27,15,9]_4$	$[[27,20,3]]$	$17 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{20}+1$	$[[27n_2, 27n_2-192, 9]]$	$[[27n_2, 20n_2-80, 9]]$
$[28,15,10]_4$	$[[28,26,2]]$	$14 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{26}+1$	$[[28n_2, 28n_2-234, 10]]$	$[[28n_2, 26n_2-208, 10]]$
$[30,15,12]_4$	$[[30,23,3]]$	$28 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{23}+1$	$[[30n_2, 30n_2-330, 12]]$	$[[30n_2, 23n_2-138, 12]]$
$[44,22,14]_4$	$[[44,42,2]]$	$35 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{42}+1$	$[[44n_2, 44n_2-572, 14]]$	$[[44n_2, 42n_2-504, 14]]$
$[53,27,15]_4$	$[[53,45,3]]$	$47 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{45}+1$	$[[53n_2, 53n_2-728, 15]]$	$[[53n_2, 45n_2-360, 15]]$

Let C_1 be a binary primitive, narrow-sense BCH code with length $n_1 = 2^m - 1$ and design distance $3 \leq \delta_1 \leq 2^{\lceil m/2 \rceil} - 1$, and $m \geq 5$ is odd. According to Ref. [20], we know that $C_1^{\perp} \subseteq C_1$ and C_1 has parameters $[n_1, n_1 - \rho_1, \geq \delta_1]$, where the number of check symbols is $\rho_1 = m\lceil 1/2(\delta_1 - 1) \rceil$. Let $C_2 = [n_2, n_2 - \delta_1 + 1, \delta_1]_{2^{\rho_1}}$ be an MDS code over the extension field $GF(2^{\rho_1})$ and $\delta_1 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{\rho_1}+1$. Then, there exists a QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1(\delta_1 - 1), \delta_1]]$ by Theorem 2.

If $\delta_1 \geq 4$, then we let $\delta_1 = \eta_1\eta_2$ or $\delta_1 - 1 = \eta_1\eta_2$, where $2 \leq \eta_1 \leq \eta_2$. Correspondingly, we construct a CQC which has the same length and similar minimum distance lower bound with the QTPC above. If $\eta_1 = 2$, we let $D_1 = [[n_1, K_1, 2]]$ be an optimal stabilizer code with dimension $K_1 = n_1 - 3$ according to Ref. [31]. If $\eta_1 > 2$, we let $D_1 = [[n_1, K_1, \geq \eta_1]]$ be a quantum BCH code which has dimension $K_1 = n_1 - 2m\lceil 1/2(\eta_1 - 1) \rceil$ and design distance η_1 by Theorem 21 in [20]. We let $D_2 = [[n_2, n_2 - 2\eta_2 + 2, \eta_2]]_{2^{K_1}}$ be a quantum MDS code over the extension field $GF(2^{K_1})$ and $\eta_2 \leq n_2 \leq 2^{K_1} + 1$ according to Ref. [32]. Then we have $\delta_1 \leq n_2 \leq \min\{2^{\rho_1}+1, 2^{K_1}+1\} = 2^{\rho_1}+1$. Hence, there exist a CQC with parameters $C_Q = [[n_1 n_2, K_1(n_2 - 2\eta_2 + 2), \eta_1\eta_2]]$. It is easy to verify that $K_1(n_2 - 2\eta_2 + 2) < n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1(\delta_1 - 1)$ if $n_2 \geq \lceil (1 - \frac{2}{m}) n_1 \rceil$. Thus, QTPCs have larger dimension than CQCs if $\lceil (1 - \frac{2}{m}) n_1 \rceil \leq n_2 \leq 2^{\rho_1} + 1$. In order to guarantee that QTPCs have larger dimension than the CQCs, we make a loose estimation of lower bound of n_2 here.

If $m \geq 4$ is even and C_1 is a quaternary primitive, narrow-sense BCH code with length $n_1 = 4^{m/2} - 1$, similar results can be obtained by using the Hermitian construction. In Table I, we compute the parameters of QTPCs constructed based on dual-containing BCH codes and those of CQCs, and list the comparisons between them. It is easy to see that all the QTPCs in Table I have parameters better than the CQCs, and when code length n_2 becomes larger, QTPCs have much larger dimension than CQCs with the same length and minimum distance. Notice that the lower bound of n_2 in Table I is much smaller than $\lceil (1 - \frac{2}{m}) n_1 \rceil$.

B. QTPCs with component codes derived from online code tables and MAGMA

The online code tables in [30] provide bounds on the parameters of classical linear codes and additive quantum codes. Almost all of those codes are Best Known Linear Codes (BKLC) or Best Known Quantum Codes (BKQC). Therefore, we can construct QTPCs with component codes C_1 chosen from the code tables in [30]. From Theorem 1, we know that each additive code $\mathbf{Q} = [[n, k]]$ in [30] corresponds to a classical additive code $\mathbf{D} = [n, (n-k)/2]_4$ that is self-orthogonal with respect to the trace-Hermitian inner product over $GF(4)$, i.e., $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{D}^{\perp_{th}}$. In particular, if code $\mathbf{D}$ is linear over $GF(4)$, then $\mathbf{D}^{\perp_{th}}$ is equal to the Hermitian dual code of code $\mathbf{D}$, i.e., $\mathbf{D}^{\perp_{th}} = \mathbf{D}^{\perp_h}$. Let $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{D}^{\perp_h}$, then $\mathbf{C}$ is a Hermitian dual-containing code, i.e., $\mathbf{C}^{\perp_h} \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. Furthermore, if $\mathbf{Q}$ is pure and has minimum distance d, then $\mathbf{C}$ has minimum distance d.

In Table II-IV, we construct many QTPCs based on the code tables in [30] and MAGMA [33] (Version 2.21-8, online). We first choose a BKQC $\mathbf{Q}$ with length less than or equal to 50 from [30] or the MAGMA database, then we can get the corresponding classical additive code $\mathbf{D}$ over $GF(4)$. By using MAGMA, we can determine that if quantum code $\mathbf{Q}$ is pure and if code $\mathbf{D}$ is linear over $GF(4)$. If quantum code $\mathbf{Q}$ is pure and code $\mathbf{D}$ is linear over $GF(4)$, then we get a Hermitian dual-containing code $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{D}^{\perp_h}$ which has the same minimum distance with $\mathbf{Q}$. All the component codes C_1 in Table II-IV except $C_1 = [6,1,6]_4$, $C_1 = [11,6,5]$ and $C_1 = [12,6,6]$ in Table III and Table IV are trace-Hermitian dual-containing additive codes that correspond to BKQCs $\mathbf{Q}$ in [30] and the MAGMA database. By using MAGMA, we know that they happen to be linear and Hermitian dual-containing codes over $GF(4)$, and have the same minimum distance with the corresponding BKQCs $\mathbf{Q}$. The codes $C_1 = [11,6,5]_4$ and $C_1 = [12,6,6]$ in Table III and Table IV are BKLCs in the database of MAGMA and it is easy to verify that they are also Hermitian dual-containing codes. All the component codes C_2 used for the construction of QTPCs in Table II-IV are MDS codes

TABLE III. Comparisons between QTPCs and quantum BCH codes. The QPTCs have component codes C_1 and C_2, where C_1 is chosen from online code tables in [30] and the MAGMA database, and C_2 is an MDS code over the extension field from [28]. The quantum BCH codes are derived from Ref. [20, 21].

Component Codes C_1	Component Codes C_2	QTPCs $\mathcal{Q}$ & Rates R	Quantum BCH codes Q_B & Rates R
$[6,1,6]_4$	$[341,337,5]_{4^5}$	$[[2^{11}-2, 2^{11}-42, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.97949$	$[[2^{11}-1, 2^{11}-45, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.97851$
$[6,1,6]_4$	$[1023,1018,6]_{4^5}$	$[[6138, 6088, 6]]$, $R\approx 0.99185$	$[[6223, 6139, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.9865$
$[11,6,5]_4$	$[744,740,5]_{4^5}$	$[[2^{13}-8, 2^{13}-48, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99511$	$[[2^{13}-1, 2^{13}-53, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99365$
$[11,6,5]_4$	$[497,493,5]_{4^5}$	$[[\frac{2^{14}-1}{3}+6, \frac{2^{14}-1}{3}-34, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99268$	$[[\frac{2^{14}-1}{3}, \frac{2^{14}-1}{3}-42, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99231$
$[11,6,5]_4$	$[425,493,5]_{4^5}$	$[[\frac{2^{15}-1}{7}-6, \frac{2^{15}-1}{7}-46, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99017$	$[[\frac{2^{15}-1}{7}, \frac{2^{15}-1}{7}-60, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.98718$
$[11,6,5]_4$	$[397,393,5]_{4^5}$	$[[\frac{2^{16}-1}{15}-2, \frac{2^{16}-1}{15}-42, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99084$	$[[\frac{2^{16}-1}{15}, \frac{2^{16}-1}{15}-48, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.98901$
$[11,6,5]_4$	$[350,346,5]_{4^5}$	$[[\frac{2^{16}-1}{17}-5, \frac{2^{16}-1}{17}-45, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.98961$	$[[\frac{2^{16}-1}{17}, \frac{2^{16}-1}{17}-48, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.98755$
$[12,6,6]_4$	$[2731,2726,6]_{4^6}$	$[[2^{15}+5, 2^{15}-55, 6]]$, $R\approx 0.99817$	$[[2^{15}-1, 2^{15}-61, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99817$
$[14,8,5]_4$	$[75,71,5]_{4^6}$	$[[\frac{2^{15}-1}{31}-7, \frac{2^{15}-1}{31}-55, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.95429$	$[[\frac{2^{15}-1}{31}, \frac{2^{15}-1}{31}-60, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.94324$
$[14,8,5]_4$	$[334,330,5]_{4^6}$	$[[\frac{2^{15}-1}{7}-5, \frac{2^{15}-1}{7}-53, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.98973$	$[[\frac{2^{15}-1}{7}, \frac{2^{15}-1}{7}-60, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.98718$
$[14,8,5]_4$	$[2340,2336,5]_{4^6}$	$[[2^{15}-8, 2^{15}-56, 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99853$	$[[2^{15}-1, 2^{15}-61, \geq 5]]$, $R\approx 0.99817$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[663,659,7]_{4^8}$	$[[\frac{2^{20}-1}{93}-4, \frac{2^{20}-1}{93}-100, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99148$	$[[\frac{2^{20}-1}{93}, \frac{2^{20}-1}{93}-100, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99113$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[823,816,7]_{4^8}$	$[[\frac{2^{20}-1}{75}+10, \frac{2^{20}-1}{75}-86, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99314$	$[[\frac{2^{20}-1}{75}, \frac{2^{20}-1}{75}-100, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99285$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[1869,1863,7]_{4^8}$	$[[\frac{2^{20}-1}{33}-2, \frac{2^{20}-1}{33}-98, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99692$	$[[\frac{2^{20}-1}{33}, \frac{2^{20}-1}{33}-100, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99685$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[7710,7704,7]_{4^8}$	$[[2^{20}+1, 2^{20}-95, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99991$	$[[2^{20}-1, 2^{20}-101, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.9999$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[971,965,7]_{4^8}$	$[[\frac{2^{21}-1}{127}-6, \frac{2^{21}-1}{127}-102, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99418$	$[[\frac{2^{21}-1}{127}, \frac{2^{21}-1}{127}-105, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99364$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[2518,2512,7]_{4^8}$	$[[\frac{2^{21}-1}{49}+7, \frac{2^{21}-1}{49}-89, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99776$	$[[\frac{2^{21}-1}{49}, \frac{2^{21}-1}{49}-105, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99755$
$[17,9,7]_4$	$[17623,17617,7]_{4^8}$	$[[\frac{2^{21}-1}{7}-2, \frac{2^{21}-1}{7}-98, 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99968$	$[[\frac{2^{21}-1}{7}, \frac{2^{21}-1}{7}-105, \geq 7]]$, $R\approx 0.99965$
$[27,15,9]_4$	$[9519,9511,9]_{4^{12}}$	$[[\frac{2^{29}-1}{2089}+14, \frac{2^{29}-1}{2089}-178, 9]]$, $R\approx 0.99925$	$[[\frac{2^{29}-1}{2089}, \frac{2^{29}-1}{2089}-203, \geq 9]]$, $R\approx 0.99921$
$[27,15,9]_4$	$[18027,18019,9]_{4^{12}}$	$[[\frac{2^{29}-1}{1103}-8, \frac{2^{29}-1}{1103}-200, 9]]$, $R\approx 0.99961$	$[[\frac{2^{29}-1}{1103}, \frac{2^{29}-1}{1103}-203, \geq 9]]$, $R\approx 0.99958$
$[27,15,9]_4$	$[85340,85332,9]_{4^{12}}$	$[[\frac{2^{29}-1}{233}+13, \frac{2^{29}-1}{233}-179, 9]]$, $R\approx 0.99992$	$[[\frac{2^{29}-1}{233}, \frac{2^{29}-1}{233}-203, \geq 9]]$, $R\approx 0.99991$

over the extension field by Ref. [28]. For the component codes $C_2 = [341,337,5]_{4^5}$ and $C_2 = [1023,1018,6]_{4^5}$ in Table III, it is easy to verify that $\psi(C_2)^{\perp_h} \subseteq \psi(C_2)$ according to [20]. In Table II, we use quantum MDS codes from [32] as the outer QECCs of CQCs. Therefore, we can obtain a lot of QTPCs from Theorem 2.

All the QTPCs in Table II have better parameters than CQCs with the same length and minimum distance, and when the component code length n_2 becomes larger, QTPCs have much higher dimension than CQCs with the same length and minimum distance. All the QTPCs in Table III except the second one have exactly similar code length and minimum distance with quantum BCH codes in [20, 21], but have higher code rates. The second QTPC in Table III has a larger difference of code length with the quantum BCH code, but have a higher code rate and larger minimum distance, then we still say that it is better than the quantum BCH code. All the QTPCs in Table IV have very similar code length and the same minimum distance with the comparable QECCs in [22], but have larger dimension. Therefore, all the QTPCs in Table III and IV have parameters better than the ones available in the previous literature.

C. QTPCs with self-dual component codes

If we combine binary or quaternary self-dual codes with an arbitrary MDS code over the extension field to construct TPCs, we can obtain QTPCs with better parameters than those in Corollary 1. Let C_1 be an arbitrary self-dual code over $GF(q)$ with parameters $[n, n/2, d]$. Let C_2 be an MDS code over the extension field with parameters $[n, n-d+1, d]$. Then we have the following result.

Corollary 2. *There exists a QTPC with parameters* $[[n^2, n^2-nd+n, d]]$, *and* $d \geq H_q^{-1}(1/2)n$ *when* $n \to \infty$.

TABLE IV. Comparisons between QTPCs and QECCs in Ref. [22]. The QPTCs have component codes C_1 and C_2, where C_1 is chosen from online code tables in [30] and the MAGMA Database, and C_2 is an MDS Code over the extension field from [28]. According to [22], $N_1(r) = 2(2^r-1)/3$, $N_2(r) = 6(2^r-1))/7$, and $N_3(r) = 4(2^r-1)/5$.

r	Component Codes C_1	Component Codes C_2	QTPCs $\mathcal{Q}$	QECCs Q in Ref. [22]
10	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[155,151,5]_{4^5}$	$[[2^r+N_1(r)-1, 2^r+N_1(r)-41, 5]]$	$[[2^r+N_1(r), 2^r+N_1(r)-42, 5]]$
10	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[124,120,5]_{4^5}$	$[[2N_1(r), 2N_1(r)-40, 5]]$	$[[2N_1(r), 2N_1(r)-42, 5]]$
12	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-4, 5]_{4^5}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{2^t+N_i(r)}{11} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{2^t+N_i(r)}{11} \rfloor$, $1 \le i \le 3$, $5 \le t \le r$	$[[11n_2, 11n_2-40, 5]]$	$[[2^t+N_i(r), 2^t+N_i(r)-38-t, 5]]$
12	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-4, 5]_{4^5}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{N_i(r)+N_j(r)}{11} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{N_i(r)+N_j(r)}{11} \rfloor$, $1 \le i,j \le 3$	$[[11n_2, 11n_2-40, 5]]$	$[[N_i(r)+N_j(r), N_i(r)+N_j(r)-50, 5]]$
12	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-4, 5]_{4^5}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{24+N_i(r)}{11} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{24+N_i(r)}{11} \rfloor$, $1 \le i \le 3$	$[[11n_2, 11n_2-40, 5]]$	$[[24+N_i(r), 24+N_i(r)-43, 5]]$
14	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[993,989,5]_{4^5}$	$[[N_1(r)+1, N_1(r)-39, 5]]$	$[[N_1(r), N_1(r)-42, 5]]$
14	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-4, 5]_{4^5}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{2^t+N_1(r)}{11} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{2^t+N_1(r)}{11} \rfloor$, $5 \le t \le 8$	$[[11n_2, 11n_2-40, 5]]$	$[[2^t+N_1(r), 2^t+N_1(r)-44-t, 5]]$
14	$[11,6,5]_4$	$[995,991,5]_{4^5}$	$[[23+N_1(r), N_1(r)-17, 5]]$	$[[24+N_1(r), N_1(r)-25, 5]]$
15	$[14,8,5]_4$	$[2008,2004,5]_{4^6}$	$[[26+N_2(r), N_2(r)-22, 5]]$	$[[24+N_2(r), N_2(r)-28, 5]]$
15	$[14,8,5]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-4, 5]_{4^5}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{2^t+N_2(r)}{14} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{2^t+N_2(r)}{14} \rfloor$, $5 \le t \le r-1$	$[[14n_2, 14n_2-48, 5]]$	$[[2^t+N_2(r), 2^t+N_2(r)-47-t, 5]]$
15	$[14,8,5]_4$	$[4012,4008,5]_{4^5}$	$[[2N_2(r)-4, 2N_2(r)-52, 5]]$	$[[2N_2(r), 2N_2(r)-62, 5]]$
15	$[12,6,6]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-5, 6]_{4^6}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{2^t+N_2(r)}{12} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{2^t+N_2(r)}{12} \rfloor$, $12 \le t \le r$	$[[12n_2, 12n_2-60, 6]]$	$[[2^t+N_2(r), 2^t+N_2(r)-49-t, 6]]$
16	$[12,6,6]_4$	$[n_2, n_2-5, 6]_{4^6}$, $n_2 = \lceil \frac{2^t+N_1(r)}{12} \rceil$, or $n_2 = \lfloor \frac{2^t+N_1(r)}{12} \rfloor$, $9 \le t \le 12$	$[[12n_2, 12n_2-60, 6]]$	$[[2^t+N_1(r), 2^t+N_1(r)-52-t, 6]]$

The proof of Corollary 2 is similar to that of Corollary 1. The rate of the QTPC in Corollary 2 is $r = 1 - \frac{d-1}{n}$ which is higher than 1/2 in Corollary 1.

V. QTPCS WITH MULTIPLE BURST ERROR-CORRECTION ABILITIES

In this section we use cyclic component codes and classical MDS codes to construct QTPCs with multiple burst error-correction abilities based on Theorem 3. The restriction on C_2 in Theorem 3 is much easier to be satisfied than that in Theorem 2, but one condition is that the product matrix $H_{c_1} H_{c_1}^T$ needs to to be a full rank. If we let C_1 be a binary cyclic code with defining set Z_1 and $\gcd(n_1, 2) = 1$, it is easy to verify that this condition on C_1 is equivalent to $Z_1 = Z_1^{-1}$, where $Z_1^{-1} = \{-z \pmod{n_1} | z \in Z_1\}$. Such cyclic codes are called *reversible* codes in [28, 34]. Denote by $f_r(x) \equiv x^{\deg f(x)} f(x^{-1})$ the *reciprocal* polynomial of $f(x)$. A monic polynomial $f(x)$ will be called *self-reciprocal* if and only if $f(x) = f_r(x)$.

Lemma 7 ([34, Theorem 1])**.** *The cyclic code generated by the monic polynomial $g(x)$ is reversible if and only if $g(x)$ is self-reciprocal.*

We denote by $\mathcal{BCH}(n, b; \delta)$ a binary BCH code with design distance δ and defining set $Z = \{\mathfrak{C}_b, \mathfrak{C}_{b+1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}_{b+\delta-2}\}$, where $\mathfrak{C}_b = \{b2^s \pmod{n} | s \in \mathbb{Z}, s \geq 0\}$ denotes the binary cyclotomic coset of b mod n, $0 \leq b \leq n-1$. For every design distance $2 \leq \delta \leq n$, there always exists at least one $b \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $Z = Z^{-1}$ from [28]. Therefore, we can always find out a reversible BCH code with design distance $2 \leq \delta \leq n$ and use it as the binary component code of the TPC.

Theorem 4. *Let n_1 be an odd integer. Let $C_1 = [n_1, 1, n_1]$ be a repetition code. Let $C_2 = [n_2, n_2 - n_1 + 1, n_1]_{2^{\rho_1}}$ be an MDS code over $GF(2^{\rho_1})$, where $n_2 \leq 2^{\rho_1}$, $\rho_1 = n_1 - 1$. If $n_1 \leq \lfloor n_2/2 \rfloor + 1$, then there exists a QTPC with parameters $[[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2(n_1-1)^2, n_1]]$. This code has a quantum analog of multiple $(\lceil \frac{n_1}{2} \rceil - 1)$-burst error-correction abilities, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks.*

Proof. If n_1 is odd, it is easy to see that $C_1 = [n_1, 1, n_1]$ is a reversible code. If the design distance $n_1 \leq \lfloor n_2/2 \rfloor + 1$ and $n_2 \leq 2^{\rho_1}$, then there exists a dual-containing MDS code $C_2 = [n_2, n_2 - n_1 + 1, n_1]_{2^{\rho_1}}$ over $GF(2^{\rho_1})$ (see [35]). Therefore, there exists a QTPC with parameters $[[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2(n_1-1)^2, n_1]]$ by Theorem 3. Combining Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we know that this code has a quantum analog of multiple $(\lceil \frac{n_1}{2} \rceil - 1)$-burst error-correction abilities, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks. □

Fire codes are a class of cyclic codes used for correcting burst errors [36]. The definition of Fire codes is given as follows. Let $b(x)$ be an irreducible polynomial of degree w over $GF(2)$. Let ρ be the period of $b(x)$ where ρ is the smallest integer such that $b(x)$ divides $x^\rho + 1$. Let l be a positive integer such that $l \leq w$, and $2l - 1$ is not divisible by ρ. Then an l-burst error-correction Fire code F is defined by the generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x^{2l-1} + 1) b(x).$$

The length n of this Fire code is the least common multiple (LCM) of $2l - 1$ and the period of ρ of $b(x)$, i.e.,

$$n = \mathrm{LCM}(2l - 1, \rho).$$

The number of check symbols of this code is $w + 2l - 1$. Note that the two factors $x^{2l-1}+1$ and $b(x)$ are relatively prime.

It is easy to see that the $(x^{2l-1} + 1)$-factor in $g(x)$ is a self-reciprocal polynomial. If we choose $b(x)$ as a self-reciprocal irreducible polynomial over $GF(2)$, then $g(x)$ is a self-reciprocal polynomial over $GF(2)$. In [37], the number of self-reciprocal irreducible polynomials of degree $w = 2t$ over $GF(2)$ is given by

$$N_2(w) = \frac{1}{2t} \sum_{d|t,\ d \text{ odd}} \mu(d) 2^{t/d}. \tag{16}$$

It is easy to verify that $N_2(w) > 0$. Therefore, we can always choose a self-reciprocal polynomial with an even degree to construct a reversible Fire code. Then we can construct QTPCs based on reversible Fire codes with multiple burst error-correction abilities.

Theorem 5. *Let $C_1 = [n_1, k_1]$ be a reversible l-burst error-correction Fire code, and let $C_2 = [n_2, k_2, n_2 - k_2 + 1]_{2^{\rho_1}}$ be a RS code over the extension field $GF(2^{\rho_1})$, and the numbers of check symbols are $\rho_1 = n_1 - k_1$ and $\rho_2 = n_2 - k_2$, respectively. If $k_2 \geq \lceil \frac{n_2}{2} \rceil$, then there exists a QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2]]$ which has a quantum analog of $\lfloor \frac{\rho_2+1}{2} \rfloor$ numbers of l-burst error-correction abilities, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks.*

Proof. Let H_{c_1} be the parity check matrix of C_1, then the product matrix $H_{c_1} H_{c_1}^T$ is of full rank if C_1 is a reversible Fire code. If $k_2 \geq \lceil \frac{n_2}{2} \rceil$, then there exists a dual-containing RS code $C_2^\perp \subseteq C_2$ according to [38]. Let $\mathcal{C} = C_2 \otimes_H C_1$ be the tensor product code of C_1 and C_2, then $\mathcal{C}$ is an $[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - \rho_1\rho_2]$ binary code which corrects $\lfloor \frac{n_2 - k_2 + 1}{2} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{\rho_2+1}{2} \rfloor$ or fewer bursts of errors, each burst is less than or equal to l, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks. Combining Lemma 2, Lemma 3 and Theorem 3, we know that there exists a QTPC with parameters $\mathcal{Q} = [[n_1 n_2, n_1 n_2 - 2\rho_1\rho_2]]$ which has a quantum analog of $\lfloor \frac{\rho_2+1}{2} \rfloor$ numbers of l-burst error-correction abilities, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks. □

Example 3. *Consider the self-reciprocal polynomial $b(x) = 1 + x^2 + x^3 + x^4$ over $GF(2)$. Its period is $\rho = 5$. Let $l = 4$. A reversible Fire code is defined by the generator polynomial $g(x) = (x^7 + 1) b(x)$. Its length*

is $n = LCM(7, 5) = 35$. Then a $[35, 24]$ reversible Fire code F with 4-burst error-correction abilities can be obtained. Choose $C = [23, 24 - t, t]$ as a narrow-sense RS code over $GF(2^{11})$. It is easy to see that if $2 \leq t \leq 12$, then $C^{\perp} \subseteq C$ from [38]. Let $\mathcal{C} = C \otimes_H F$ be the tensor product code of C and F, then $\mathcal{C}$ is an $[805, 816 - 11t]$ binary code which corrects $\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor$ or fewer bursts of errors, each burst is less than or equal to 4, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks. Then there exists a QTPC $\mathcal{Q} = [[805, 827 - 22t]]$ with a quantum analog of $\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor$ numbers of 4-burst error-correction abilities, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks.

VI. DECODING OF QTPCS

The decoding procedure for the classical TPCs can be done by performing an outer decoding firstly, followed by an inner decoding [6, 9]. The decoding of QTPCs can be done similarly.

i) Outer Decoding: Through performing outer measurement on the ancilla qubits, the syndrome is calculated as a q-ary vector and is mapped to a vector with subblocks over $GF(q^{\rho_1})$. Then the outer recovery and decoding are performed.

ii) Inner Decoding: If the outer decoding is successfully accomplished, the erroneous subblocks could be determined. Then measurement is performed on the ancilla qubits correlated with the erroneous subblocks. Finally, the inner decoding is performed only on the erroneous subblocks.

VII. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

A general construction of QTPCs was proposed in this paper. Since the parity check matrix of a classical TPC has a tensor product structure, the construction of the corresponding QTPC is less constrained compared to other classes of QECCs, and this leads to many choices of selecting component codes in designing various of QTPCs. Compared with CQCs, the component code selections of QTPCs are much more flexible than those of CQCs. Several families of QTPCs have been constructed with parameters better than other classes of QECCs. It is worth noting that all QTPCs constructed are pure and have exact parameters. In particular, QTPCs have multiple quantum burst error-correction abilities as their classical counterparts, provided these bursts fall in distinct subblocks. Moreover, the QTPCs construction can be generalized to the quantum generalized tensor product codes (GTPCs, see [8]) construction in future work. Finally, whether QTPCs could be used in quantum storage systems just like what happened of classical TPCs is worthy of further investigation in future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank...

[1] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).
[2] P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493 (1995).
[3] D. Gottesman, *Stabilizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction*, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology (1997).
[4] A. Ketkar, A. Klappenecker, S. Kumar, and P. K. Sarvepalli, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **52**, 4892 (2006).
[5] A. Calderbank, E. Rains, P. Shor, and N. Sloane, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **44**, 1369 (1998).
[6] J. K. Wolf, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **11**, 281 (1965).
[7] J. K. Wolf, in *Proc. IEEE ITW* (Chengdu, China, 2006) pp. 6–10.
[8] H. Imai and H. Fujiya, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **27**, 181 (1981).
[9] H. Alhussien and J. Moon, IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun. **2**, 228 (2010).
[10] P. Chaichanavong and P. H. Siegel, IEEE Trans. Magn. **42**, 350 (2006).
[11] P. Chaichanavong and P. H. Siegel, IEEE Trans. Magn. **42**, 214 (2006).
[12] R. Gabrys, E. Yaakobi, and L. Dolecek, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **59**, 2315 (2013).
[13] M. N. Kaynak, P. R. Khayat, and S. Parthasarathy, IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun. **32**, 892 (2014).
[14] P. Huang, E. Yaakobi, H. Uchikawa, and P. H. Siegel, in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory* (IEEE, Hong Kong, 2015) pp. 1871–1875.
[15] P. Huang, E. Yaakobi, H. Uchikawa, and P. H. Siegel, arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06960 (2015).
[16] M. Grassl and M. Rötteler, in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory* (Adelaide, SA, Australia, 2005) pp. 1018–1022.
[17] G. G. La Guardia, Int. J. Quantum Inform. **10**, 1250005 (2012).
[18] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, arXiv preprint quant-ph/9608012 (1996).
[19] M. Grassl, P. Shor, G. Smith, J. Smolin, and B. Zeng, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 050306 (2009).
[20] S. Aly, A. Klappenecker, P. K. Sarvepalli, *et al.*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **53**, 1183 (2007).
[21] S. Ling, J. Luo, and C. Xing, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **56**, 4080 (2010).
[22] R. Li and X. Li, Discrete Mathematics **308**, 1603 (2008).
[23] F. Caruso, V. Giovannetti, C. Lupo, and S. Mancini, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 1203 (2014).
[24] F. Vatan, V. P. Roychowdhury, and M. Anantram, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **45**, 1703 (1999).
[25] S. Kawabata, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **69**, 3540 (2000).
[26] G. Nebe, E. M. Rains, and N. J. A. Sloane, *Self-Dual Codes and Invariant Theory*, Vol. 17 (Springer, 2006).

[27] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098 (1996).
[28] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes* (The Netherlands: North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981).
[29] J. Maucher, V. V. Zyablov, and M. Bossert, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **46**, 642 (2000).
[30] M. Grassl, "Bounds on the minimum distance of linear codes and quantum codes," Online available at `http://www.codetables.de` (2007).
[31] E. M. Rains, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **45**, 266 (1999).
[32] M. Rötteler, M. Grassl, and T. Beth, in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory* (Chicago, IL, USA, 2004) pp. 356–356.
[33] J. Cannon, W. Bosma, C. Fieker, and A. Steel, *Handbook of Magma Functions* (Sydney, 2008) pp. 4367–4554.
[34] J. L. Massey, Information and Control **7**, 369 (1964).
[35] Z. Li, L.-J. Xing, and X.-M. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012308 (2008).
[36] S. Lin and D. J. Costello, *Error Control Coding: Fundamentals and Applications*, 2nd ed. (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2004).
[37] J. L. Yucas and G. L. Mullen, Designs, Codes and Cryptography **33**, 275 (2004).
[38] M. Grassl, W. Geiselmann, and T. Beth, in *Applied Algebra, Algebraic Algorithms and Error-correcting Codes* (Springer, 1999) pp. 231–244.